

Tuition Assistance Program

Program Evaluation
Office of Human Resources
May 4, 2010

CountyStat Principles

- **Require Data Driven Performance**
- **Promote Strategic Governance**
- **Increase Government Transparency**
- **Foster a Culture of Accountability**



Agenda

- **Welcome and introductions**
- **Description of the Tuition Assistance Program**
 - Program goals
 - Program participation
- **Evaluation design**
- **Findings**
 - General findings
 - By department
 - By employee age
 - By year of hire
 - By bargaining unit
- **Wrap-up and follow-up items**



Meeting Purpose

- **Evaluate to what extent the Tuition Assistance Program is meeting its program goals**



Tuition Assistance Program

- **Program goal:** Help the employee improve his/her job performance and career potential
- **The Tuition Assistance Program has two parts:**
 - **Job Improvement Program:** provides funding for individual courses for job improvement not leading to a degree
 - **Educational Assistance Program:** provides funding for courses leading toward a degree
- **Program guidelines:**
 - The program is available to regular, full-time and part-time Montgomery County employees
 - Program guidelines have been recently revised for MCGEO and Montgomery County Volunteer Fire Fighters. OHR is revising TAP Personnel Policies and Procedures for Non-Represented employees. The program is currently suspended for FOP, IAFF, and Non-Represented employees.
 - All course work must be completed with a passing grade or certificate of completion or the employee must reimburse the county
 - All course(s) must be taken during employee's off-duty hours
 - Employees who participate in the program agree to remain with the County for at least one to two years after course completion



Number of Participants and Courses By Fiscal Year FY03-FY10

Fiscal Year	Job Improvement		Educational Assistance		Total	
	Participants	Courses	Participants	Courses	Participants	Courses
2003	237	265	274	340	408	605
2004	289	340	276	349	467	689
2005	271	317	297	359	490	676
2006	260	295	309	372	518	667
2007	335	381	344	418	636	799
2008	335	379	332	406	616	785
2009	478	529	356	404	727	933
2010	129	143	272	303	338	446
Total	1,529	2,649	1,269	2,951	2,092	5,600



Data includes only approved courses where bill has either been paid or is in process.

Tuition Assistance
Program

Program Expenditures by Fiscal Year FY03-FY10

Fiscal Year	Job Improvement	Educational Assistance	Total
2003	\$104,825	\$195,975	\$300,799
2004	\$168,794	\$241,307	\$410,101
2005	\$176,781	\$264,991	\$441,772
2006	\$172,823	\$310,224	\$483,047
2007	\$237,680	\$361,265	\$598,945
2008	\$339,104	\$387,424	\$726,529
2009	\$551,846	\$426,310	\$978,156
2010	\$116,075	\$346,012	\$462,087
Grand Total	\$1,868,632	\$2,533,508	\$4,402,140



Data includes only approved courses where bill has either been paid or is in process.

Tuition Assistance
Program

Number of Participants by Department FY03-FY10

Dept.	Total personnel*	Number of participants			% of personnel participating
		Job Improve.	Education Assistance	Total	
MCPD	1,506	566	251	700	46.5%
HHS	1,356	254	213	394	29.1%
MCFRS	1,103	180	128	266	24.1%
DOCR	473	59	81	129	27.3%
DOT	1,323	49	91	125	9.4%
All other	2,210	149	180	291	13.2%
All	7,971	1,257	944	1,905	23.9%



* Number of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active on 4/8/2010.

Tuition Assistance
Program

Number of Participants by Employee Age

Age Range	Total personnel*	Number of participants			% of personnel participating
		Job Improve.	Education Assistance	Total	
<30	513	122	88	191	37.2%
30-39	1,682	407	283	595	35.4%
40-49	2,511	401	330	626	24.9%
50-59	2,425	262	213	410	16.9%
60+	840	65	30	83	9.9%
All	7,971	1,257	944	1,905	23.9%



* Number of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active on 4/8/2010.

Number of Participants by Year of Hire FY03-FY10

Year of Hire	Total personnel*	Number of participants			% of personnel participating
		Job Improve.	Education Assistance	Total	
<1980	482	45	27	60	12.4%
1980-1989	1,672	231	135	322	19.3%
1990-1999	2,353	437	308	636	27.0%
2000+	3,464	544	474	887	25.6%
All	7,971	1,257	944	1,905	23.9%



* Number of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active on 4/8/2010.

Tuition Assistance
Program

10

5/4/2010



Number of Participants by Bargaining Unit FY03-FY10

Bargaining Unit	Total personnel*	Number of participants			% of personnel participating
		Job Improve.	Education Assistance	Total	
IAFF	935	153	108	227	24.3%
FOP	1,003	509	179	591	58.9%
MCGEO - all	3,920	411	458	753	19.2%
OPT	2,906	378	406	680	23.4%
SLT	1,014	33	52	73	7.2%
Non-rep	2,112	184	199	334	15.8%
All	7,971	1,257	944	1,905	23.9%



* Number of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active on 4/8/2010.

Evaluation Design Notes

- **Three measures of “job performance and career potential” were examined**
 - Retention rate
 - Salary growth
 - Grade advancement
- **All program participants from FY03-FY10 that were actively employed on 6/25/2007 were included in the analysis**
- **Salary and grade data was drawn from the Human Capital Management (HCM) system and reflects the status of current employees on two dates: 6/25/2007 and 4/8/2010**
 - Department, age, and bargaining unit analysis reflect the affiliations personnel had on 6/25/2007

Note that this evaluation examines the correlation between program participation and retention rate, salary growth, and grade advancement. This evaluation does not necessarily imply a causal relationship.



Findings: General Summary

- **Overall, employees who participated in the Montgomery County Tuition Assistance Program had a higher retention rate, higher salary growth, and grade advancement than individuals who did not participate in the Tuition Assistance Program.**
- **MCPD had the highest participation in the Tuition Assistance Program followed by HHS, MCFS, DOCR, and DOT**
- **In terms of salary growth, most of the benefits are seen during or shortly after the individual's participation in the program. Employees who took classes in multiple years also see growth in their salary.**
- **It appears that different people of different ages or lengths of service use the TAP program in different ways.**
 - Younger employees do not see additional salary growth but do see significant grade advancement
 - Longer-serving employees do not see salary growth or grade advancement but are retained at higher rates



Findings: General Summary

- **Employees participating in TAP through HHS had a higher retention rate than other employees who didn't participate in TAP.**
 - Many employees in HHS use TAP to take courses and seminars not leading to a degree to maintain their licensure.
 - In this way, TAP funds serve as an important retention tool in assisting HHS staff to fulfill their licensure requirements and may not be as strong incentive for grade advancement or salary growth within HHS.
 - By retaining “in demand” clinical professionals at greater rates, OHR reduces the hiring and training costs to the County of clinical professionals within HHS.
 - This is an area that OHR will need to further explore.

- **The results from this evaluation will be used as a baseline measure and OHR will work with CountyStat to evaluate the same measures every three years to continue to monitor key trends and issues.**



Findings: Retention Rate

- Retention rate shown is the percent of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active employees on 4/8/2010
- The difference in retention rate between the Job Improvement Program and the Educational Assistance Program is also statistically significant

Program Participation	Retention Rate
Job Improvement Program	92.2%
Educational Assistance Program	89.5%
Both	90.8%
None	85.1%
All employees	86.5%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant and are in comparison with personnel that did not participate in the program at all.



Findings: Salary Growth

- Compared annual base salary on 6/25/2007 with annual base salary on 4/8/2010
- Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates
- The difference in salary growth between the two programs is not statistically significant

Program Participation	Average Salary Growth
Job Improvement Program	20.2%
Educational Assistance Program	20.6%
Both	20.2%
None	17.8%
All employees	18.4%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant and are in comparison with personnel that did not participate in the program at all.



Findings: Salary Growth Comparison by Year of Participation

- **Salary growth has increased over the last seven fiscal years**
- **In terms of salary growth, most of the benefits are seen during or shortly after the individual's participation in the program**
- **Employees who took classes in multiple years also see growth in their salary**

Year of participation	Average salary growth
FY03	17.3%
FY04	18.2%
FY05	19.1%
FY06	20.0%
FY07	20.9%
FY08	22.5%
FY09	22.8%
FY10	21.6%
Took classes in multiple years	20.8%
No participation	17.8%



Highlighted differences are statistically significant and are in comparison with personnel that did not participate in the program at all.

Findings: Grade Advancement

- Compared employee grade on 6/25/2007 with employee grade on 4/8/2010
- Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates
- Employees had to be within the same grade ladder to be categorized as “declined”, “same”, or “improved”
- Employees that changed grade ladders were categorized as “moved”
 - For example, moved from a grade 015 to a grade 0C4

Grade Movement	Non-participants	Participants
Declined	1.3%	1.1%
Same	77.7%	67.7%
Improved	16.3%	25.3%
Moved	4.7%	5.9%
Total personnel	6,066	1,905

Highlighted differences are statistically significant and are in comparison with non-participants



Findings: By Department Retention Rate

OHR Commentary on findings

- All Departments with employees participating in the TAP had a higher retention rate versus employees not participating in the program.
- DOCR, MCPD, MCFRS, HHS, and DOT had the highest retention rates for employees who participated in TAP versus those employees who did not.

Dept.	TAP Participant		Diff
	No	Yes	
MCPD	84.3%	93.3%	9.0%
HHS	83.1%	87.6%	4.5%
MCFRS	89.0%	94.7%	5.6%
DOCR	83.5%	92.8%	9.3%
DOT	85.5%	89.9%	4.4%
All other	85.0%	87.4%	2.4%
All	85.1%	91.1%	5.9%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Retention rate shown is the percent of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active employees on 4/8/2010

Tuition Assistance
Program

19

5/4/2010



Findings: By Department Salary Growth

OHR Commentary on findings

- **MCPD, MCFRS, DOCR, DOT, and all other departments except HHS showed increased salary growth among TAP participants.**
 - While HHS had no statistically significant salary growth overall, it did have a higher retention rate
 - HHS employees tend to take courses with the aim of retaining licensure rather than positioning themselves for career growth

Dept.	TAP Participant		Diff.
	No	Yes	
MCPD	18.4%	22.1%	3.7%
HHS	17.5%	17.5%	0.0%
MCFRS	17.5%	19.3%	1.8%
DOCR	20.1%	23.1%	2.9%
DOT	17.9%	19.6%	1.7%
All other	17.4%	20.1%	2.7%
All	17.8%	20.3%	2.5%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Percent growth: annual base salary on 6/25/2007 to annual base salary on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates

Tuition Assistance
Program

20

5/4/2010



Findings: By Department Grade Advancement

Dept	Non-participants		Participants		Difference		
	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Total
MCPD	22.1%	2.2%	33.9%	1.9%	11.8%	-0.4%	11.4%
HHS	9.6%	1.7%	11.4%	0.8%	1.9%	-0.9%	1.0%
MCFRS	26.5%	1.9%	27.8%	5.6%	1.3%	3.7%	5.0%
DOCR	9.0%	50.6%	13.2%	55.0%	4.2%	4.5%	8.6%
DOT	13.3%	0.8%	24.8%	0.8%	11.5%	0.0%	11.6%
All other	15.9%	2.8%	26.8%	3.1%	10.9%	0.3%	11.2%
All	16.3%	4.7%	25.3%	5.9%	9.0%	1.2%	10.2%

Total differences shown highlighted are statistically significant



*Compared employee grade on 6/25/2007 with employee grade on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates*

Tuition Assistance
Program

21

5/4/2010



Findings: By Department Grade Advancement

OHR Commentary on findings

- **Employees participating in TAP showed improved grade advancement overall than other County employees who did not participate in TAP.**
- **Overall employees participating in TAP showed a slight improvement in lateral movement in their career versus employees who did not participate in TAP.**
- **Movement and improvement of employees participating in TAP varies across departments.**
- **Employees utilize the TAP in different ways and derive different value from it.**



Findings: By Employee Age Retention Rate

OHR Commentary on findings

- Employees participating in TAP showed increased retention over all age groups, particularly ages 50-59.

Age range	TAP Participant		Diff
	No	Yes	
<30	83.0%	86.8%	3.8%
30-39	86.3%	91.5%	5.2%
40-49	91.3%	92.7%	1.5%
50-59	85.8%	94.5%	8.7%
60+	71.2%	73.5%	2.2%
All	85.1%	91.1%	5.9%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Retention rate shown is the percent of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active employees on 4/8/2010

Tuition Assistance
Program

23

5/4/2010



Findings: By Employee Age Salary Growth

OHR Commentary on findings

- There are clear differences in the way different groups participate in TAP including age.
- As a percentage, employees in ages 30-49 participate in the TAP program more often than other groups.
- Employees over the age of 50 show no significant salary growth.

Age range	TAP Participant		Diff
	No	Yes	
<30	28.5%	29.0%	0.5%
30-39	22.9%	24.2%	1.4%
40-49	17.7%	18.3%	0.7%
50-59	15.1%	15.0%	0.0%
60+	13.6%	13.6%	0.0%
All	17.8%	20.3%	2.5%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Percent growth: annual base salary on 6/25/2007 to annual base salary on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates

Tuition Assistance
Program

24

5/4/2010



Findings: By Employee Age Grade Advancement

Age Range	Non-participants		Participants		Difference		
	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Total
<30	54.7%	4.0%	81.2%	3.1%	26.5%	-1.2%	25.3%
30-39	25.9%	7.5%	30.9%	8.6%	5.0%	1.1%	6.1%
40-49	14.4%	5.5%	14.9%	6.9%	0.6%	1.2%	1.8%
50-59	11.2%	2.6%	11.2%	2.7%	0.3%	-0.2%	0.1%
60+	6.3%	2.4%	6.0%	0.0%	0.2%	-2.9%	-2.7%
All	16.6%	4.4%	25.4%	5.8%	9.0%	1.2%	10.2%

Total differences shown highlighted are statistically significant



*Compared employee grade on 6/25/2007 with employee grade on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates*

Tuition Assistance
Program

25

5/4/2010



Findings: By Employee Age Grade Advancement

OHR Commentary on findings

- **Grade advancement by participants of the TAP varies.**
- **Grade advancement is particularly strong in employees participating in TAP under 30 with a 25% increase in advancement over their counterparts.**
- **Employees over the age of 60 show no significant lateral movement grade advancement. This could be attributed being at the top of their pay grade or nearing retirement. Further examination is needed.**



Findings: By Year of Hire Retention Rate

OHR Commentary on findings

- Overall, employees who participated in the TAP had a higher retention rate than individuals who did not participate in the Tuition Assistance Program.
- Employees employed over 30 years had the highest retention rate.
- It appears that employees with different lengths of service use the TAP program in different ways and derive different value from it.

Year of Hire	TAP Participant		Diff
	No	Yes	
<1980	63.6%	77.9%	14.4%
1980-1989	86.3%	92.3%	6.0%
1990-1999	90.8%	93.4%	2.6%
2000+	85.8%	90.1%	4.3%
All	85.1%	91.1%	5.9%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Retention rate shown is the percent of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active employees on 4/8/2010

Tuition Assistance
Program

27

5/4/2010



Findings: By Year of Hire Salary Growth

OHR Commentary on findings

- Overall, employees who participated in the TAP had a higher salary growth rate than individuals who did not participate in the Tuition Assistance Program.
- Employees who participated in the TAP and were hired prior to 1989 had less salary growth than those hired after 1989.
 - This could be attributed to employees being at the top of their pay grade.

Year of Hire	TAP Participant		Diff
	No	Yes	
<1980	9.7%	10.3%	0.6%
1980-1989	11.4%	11.9%	0.6%
1990-1999	17.6%	19.4%	1.7%
2000+	22.6%	24.8%	2.1%
All	17.8%	20.3%	2.5

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Percent growth: annual base salary on 6/25/2007 to annual base salary on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates

Tuition Assistance
Program

28

5/4/2010



Findings: By Year of Hire Grade Advancement

Year of Hire	Non-participants		Participants		Difference		
	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Total
<1980	8.8%	2.8%	3.3%	0.0%	-6.6%	-1.7%	-8.3%
1980-1989	9.3%	2.7%	9.6%	3.7%	0.8%	0.5%	1.4%
1990-1999	10.9%	4.1%	12.4%	6.0%	1.5%	1.9%	3.4%
2000+	25.4%	5.8%	41.8%	6.9%	16.8%	0.7%	17.5%
All	16.6%	4.4%	25.4%	5.8%	9.0%	1.2%	10.2%

Total differences shown highlighted are statistically significant



*Compared employee grade on 6/25/2007 with employee grade on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates*

Tuition Assistance
Program

29

5/4/2010



Findings: By Year of Hire Grade Advancement

OHR Commentary on findings

- **Overall, Participation in the TAP improves grade advancement and lateral movement for all County employees versus those who did not participate in the TAP.**
- **The TAP improves the grade advancement of employees who have been with the County most since 2000 or less compared to those who have not participated in the TAP.**
- **It appears that TAP has not improved the grade advancement for those employees who have been employed since before 1980 versus those who did not participate in the TAP.**
 - This could be attributed to an employee reaching the top of his or her career ladder or nearing retirement.
 - The program affects retention rates in this group much more.
 - Further examination is needed to explore this issue.



Findings: By Bargaining Unit Retention Rate

OHR Commentary on findings

- All employees who participated in TAP, regardless of their bargaining unit and non-represented employees, had a 5.9% greater retention rate than those employees who did not participate in the TAP.
- MCGEO-SLT has over 10% retention rate, followed by FOP, Non-represented, IAFF, MCGEO-All, and MCGEO-OPT
 - However, MCGEO-SLT members participate at lower rates than members of other bargaining units

Bargaining Unit	TAP Participant		Diff
	No	Yes	
IAFF	90.3%	94.6%	4.3%
FOP	87.3%	93.4%	6.1%
MCGEO - all	85.8%	90.0%	4.1%
OPT	85.8%	89.4%	3.5%
SLT	85.9%	96.1%	10.1%
Non-represented	81.6%	87.4%	5.8%
All	85.1%	91.1%	5.9%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Retention rate shown is the percent of active regular employees on 6/25/2007 that were still active employees on 4/8/2010

Tuition Assistance
Program

31

5/4/2010



Findings: By Bargaining Unit Salary Growth

OHR Commentary on findings

- All employees who participated in the TAP showed more salary growth than those employees who did not participate in the TAP.
- FOP showed the most salary growth, for employees participating in the TAP compared to those employees who did not participate followed by MCGEO-SLT, IAFF, Non-Represented, MCGEO-OPT, MCGEO-All

Bargaining Unit	TAP Participant		Diff.
	No	Yes	
IAFF	17.4%	19.1%	1.7%
FOP	20.1%	22.8%	2.7%
MCGEO - all	17.9%	19.4%	1.5%
OPT	17.7%	19.3%	1.6%
SLT	18.3%	20.7%	2.4%
Non-represented	17.3%	18.9%	1.6%
All	17.8%	20.3%	2.5%

Highlighted differences are statistically significant



Percent growth: annual base salary on 6/25/2007 to annual base salary on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates

Tuition Assistance
Program

32

5/4/2010



Findings: By Bargaining Unit Grade Advancement

Bargain Unit	Non-participants		Participants		Difference		
	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Improve	Moved	Total
IAFF	24.7%	2.0%	24.2%	6.2%	-0.5%	4.2%	3.7%
FOP	26.2%	3.4%	35.4%	1.9%	9.2%	-1.5%	7.6%
MCGEO - all	13.2%	5.4%	17.8%	8.8%	4.6%	3.4%	8.0%
OPT	15.1%	7.6%	18.2%	9.6%	3.1%	2.0%	5.1%
SLT	8.7%	0.1%	13.7%	1.4%	5.0%	1.3%	6.2%
Non-rep	17.0%	3.9%	25.4%	6.0%	9.1%	1.3%	10.4%
All	16.6%	4.4%	25.4%	5.8%	9.0%	1.2%	10.2%

Total differences shown highlighted are statistically significant



*Compared employee grade on 6/25/2007 with employee grade on 4/8/2010
Includes only employees that were active, regular employees on both dates*

Tuition Assistance
Program

33

5/4/2010



Findings: By Bargaining Unit Grade Advancement

OHR Commentary on findings

- **All bargaining units except FOP showed improved advancement and lateral movement. Non-represented employees showed improved advancement and lateral movement.**

- **This internal advancement and lateral movement with Montgomery County Government will help**
 - Reduce overall hiring costs
 - Assist in retaining institutional knowledge
 - Provide opportunities for internal promotion, career development, and cross-agency knowledge management.

- **FOP showed a -1.5% difference in movement as compared to those employees who did not participate in TAP but a 9.2% grade improvement.**



Wrap-Up

- **Follow-up Items**

